

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. BOX 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/602,417	06/23/2003	Dean M. Walker	WALK01USU1	WALKOIUSUI 9600	
27479	7590 12/09/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	FREUND & YOUNG	PETRAVICK, MEREDITH C			
2026 CARIB SUITE 200	OU DR		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
FORT COLI	LINS, CO 80525		3671		

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/602,417	WALKER, DEAN M.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Meredith C. Petravick	3671	

	Meredith C. Petravick	3671			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 29 November 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in the same of the sam	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		•		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		36(a) and the appropria	te extension fee		
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as		
	dianas with 27 CED 41 27 must be	filed within two month	a of the date of		
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th			
	hut wing to the date of filling a brief	ما المسموسة منا عمل الثناء			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because         <ul> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> </ul> </li> </ol>					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			the issues for		
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).		
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			( , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the		
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		II be entered and an e	explanation of		
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a		
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.		
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See attached.</li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:		
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	1 -		
13.  Other:		Meredith C Petravion Primary Examiner	ck		

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/29/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

First, Applicant argues that the limitations rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph are not indefinite because one of ordinary skill in the art would know what the term "substantial" included. However in this case, where the specification contains no indication or guidance, it is unclear what Applicant means by the term "substantial."

Second, Applicant's argues that Wenzel and Sewell discloses a clear teaching away from the combination of Wenzel, Sewell and Smith because they disclose a unitary mower deck and tractor. However, this is not a clear teaching away from the combination. Neither of these references states anywhere that it would be nonobvious or not desirable to make the mower deck follow the contours of the ground. Disclosing a unitary structure is not "a clear teaching away." Smith provides the motivation of the combination (Col. 1, lines 16-28).

Finally, Applicant argues that the combination does not disclose each and every limitation because none of the prior art discloses a deck that pivots longitudinally. Contrary to Applicant's argument, in Smith the mower deck pivots longitudinally. See Col. 4, lines 53-65. As the mower deck pivots around the longitudinal axis, the rear end of the mower deck is elevated. This happens in response to the changes in the ground terrain.

Application/Control Number: 10/602,417 Page 3

Art Unit: 3671

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meredith C. Petravick whose telephone number is 571-272-6995. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 8:00 a.m.- 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas B. Will can be reached on 571-272-6998. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Meredith C Petravick Primary Examiner Art Unit 3671

December 6, 2005